

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,373	06/20/2003	Leslie W. Richards	CM-101US	8509
24314	7590 11/25/2005		EXAM	INER
JANSSON, SHUPE & MUNGER & ANTARAMIAN, LTD 245 MAIN STREET			HECKENBERG .	JR, DONALD H
	RACINE, WI 53403		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1722	<del></del>

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/600,373	RICHARDS, LESLIE W.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Donald Heckenberg	1722		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	on appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address		
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failt Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUN CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a tition. y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC by statute, cause the application to become a	ICATION. To reply be timely filed  ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n 08 November 2005.			
·	_	☐ This action is non-final.			
3)□	, <del></del>				
	closed in accordance with the practice u	nder Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposit	ion of Claims				
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-25 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w Claim(s) 12-14 and 23-25 is/are allowed Claim(s) 1-7, 11, 15, and 17-22 is/are re Claim(s) 8-10 is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction	ithdrawn from consideration jected.			
Applicat	ion Papers				
	The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer			
	The drawing(s) filed on <u>20 June 2003</u> is/a Applicant may not request that any objection	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ obj	•		
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by	•			
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
а)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for f  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority doc  2. Certified copies of the priority doc  3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International See the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in the priority documents have bee Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage		
Attachmen	• •				
1) Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9	4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date		
3) 🔲 Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-s mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO er No(s)/Mail Date		Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)		

Application/Control Number: 10/600,373

Art Unit: 1722

1. The finality of the rejection of the last Office Action has been withdrawn based upon Applicant's remarks and amendment filed 05 November 2005 and upon reconsideration of the prior art as described below. The amendment filed on 05 November 2005 has been entered.

Page 2

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. The factual inquiries set forth in <u>Graham v. John Deere</u>

  <u>Co.</u>, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 1722

4. Claims 1-6, 15, and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Pub. No. 11-42644

(previously of record; hereinafter "JP '644") in view of

Pleasant et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,168,415; previously of record).

Reference below will be made to the drawings of JP '644, as well as the computer translation and English abstract both previously made of record.

JP '644 discloses a baffle plate for installation in a coolant passage of a mold. The baffle comprises a coolant-encountered fin (20) and base member (25) in mechanical engagement therewith (see Fig. 2). The based member (25) has a round sidewall of diameter greater than the baffle plate and a knob (25b) which serve as a mold connection portion (see Fig. 3). As shown in Figs 1, 2, 5, 6, and 9 the fin can have a coolant contacting portion that is plate-like or helical.

Mechanically attached to the coolant-encountering fin through a mating connection with a male interconnecting member (24 and 24a) integral with the fin and a female interconnecting member (25a) integral with the base member. JP '644 appears to show this connection to be tight in that the male and female portions are closely sized (see Fig. 2). JP '644, however, does not explicitly disclose the strength of the engagement.

Art Unit: 1722

Pleasant et al. discloses a baffle device for use in a coolant passage of a molding device. The baffle include a coolant encountering fin portion (102) and a base member (104). Pleasant notes that rigidity is important part of the device when in use in order to lock the baffle device a position within the mold (see cl. 6, ll. 19-21). As such, even though JP '644 does not explicitly disclose a tolerance-fit tight mechanical engagement between the fin and base member, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time of Applicant's invention as such because such a design would have enable to the formation of a rigid baffle device that could be locked into position within the mold as suggested by Pleasant.

5. Claims 7, 11, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over JP '644 and Pleasant as

applied to claims 1-6, 15, 17-20 above, and further in view of

Kelly (U.S. Pat. No. 2,770,011; previously of record).

JP '644 and Pleasant disclose and suggest the baffle plate as described above. JP '644 and Pleasant do not disclose a mold connecting portion and extension portion as recited in claims 7, 11, and 22. Kelly, however, discloses an injection-type molding machine provided with a baffle device (48), wherein the baffle includes a mold connecting portion with a threaded outer surface

Application/Control Number: 10/600,373

Art Unit: 1722

and a extension portion which extends from the mold connection portion to the coolant fin (Fig. 2). The configuration of the device allows the baffle to be situated within the injection mold (see Fig. 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified the baffle plate of JP '644 and Pleasant as such to have included a threaded mold connecting portion and an extension portion because such a configuration is known in the art to allow for the baffle plate to be positioned within an injection mold as suggested by Kelly.

Page 5

- 6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 7. Claims 8-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 8. Claims 12-14 and 23-25 are allowed.

Application/Control Number: 10/600,373

Art Unit: 1722

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald Heckenberg whose telephone number is (571) 272-1131. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.

Page 6

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith, can be reached at (571) 272-1166. The official fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <<a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).

Donald Heckenberg

- 11-21-5

Primary Examiner

A.U. 1722